

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MINUTES WITH SUPPLEMENTAL TRANSCRIPT
(Where a supplemental transcript is available, it is printed in bold type)

OFFICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

Prescott, Arizona
28, 2005

March

The Board of Supervisors met in special session on March 28, 2005, at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Carol Springer, Chairman; Thomas Thurman, Vice Chairman; Chip Davis, Member; Bev Staddon, Clerk.

Also present: Jim Holst, County Administrator; Dave Hunt, Board Attorney/Assistant County Administrator; Randy Schurr, Deputy County Attorney; Ken Spedding Development Services Director; Enalo Lockard, Development Services Assistant Director; Steve Mauk, Land Use Manager, Development Services; Jack Judd, Chief Building Official, Development Services; Charlie Cook, Fire Marshal, Central Yavapai Fire District.

STUDY SESSIONS

S – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES – All items presented by Development Services Director Ken Spedding.

S1. Discussion regarding Rural/Urbanizing Overlay Zones and enforcement of building codes.

Mr. Spedding reminded the Board that last year the prior Board had approved expansion of the building code area and that the current Board had, in January 2005, approved holding implementation of the expansion until July 1, 2005. He said the implementation date was rapidly approaching and that he wanted to talk about whether the expansion should be phased in or whether the Board wanted to consider implementing the codes on a County-wide basis. He said the County was currently using the 2003 International Building Code and that all of the jurisdictions in the County were using the same code, but that some of them would be moving to adopt the 2006 codes for implementation in January of 2007. Mr. Spedding said that perhaps 2007 would be a good time to implement the codes County-wide. Chairman Springer asked Mr. Spedding what this change would mean in terms of fees and inspections. Mr. Spedding said that for a single family home it could mean an increase in fees of upwards of \$2,000 if the home was located in the building code expansion area. Chairman Springer said she recalled past discussions about this issue and that if she recalled correctly, Mr. Spedding had said that the additional inspections that would be required by expanding the code to other parts of the County could be done with existing personnel simply by arranging schedules. She asked if that was still true or whether she had misunderstood his statement. Mr. Spedding said he would need to add staff in order to provide inspections, adding that permits were up almost 600 over 2003. Supervisor Davis referred to the items for which permits are required, asking if it might be possible to expand the inspection area but reduce the number of items that require a building permit. He said there were items on the list that he was not sure the County needed to inspect, such as re-roofing or structural roof repair. He said he did not believe the County needed to inspect new doors or windows, hot water heaters or HVAC units, new decks or barns or shelters for animals. Supervisor Davis said perhaps the County could just focus on real health and safety issues and that by reducing the responsibilities staff might be able to handle the expanded inspections. Supervisor Thurman asked whether a roof that was not re-roofed correctly would come back on the contractor. He said he was more concerned about when people do such work themselves, adding that when Prescott Valley suffered a devastating hail storm the area was flooded with "storm chasers" who would have gotten away with shoddy work had it not been for inspections. Supervisor Thurman said that with regard to water heaters, if it was electrical to electrical or gas to gas there was no problem, but that if it was electrical to gas then an inspection was needed. He said he was concerned with safety issues. Supervisor Davis asked if the County would be responsible if someone's roof blew off. Supervisor Thurman said he knew that inspections represented government intrusion, but that on the other hand he believed the County had a responsibility for safety and that most of the codes dealt with safety issues. He said he had a problem with trying to police what goes on in the outlying rural areas, and that there was always a lot of stuff going on for which people did not even get a zoning clearance. Supervisor Thurman said Coconino County provided inspections in the outlying areas but that from what he had heard it was a real nightmare. He said if the County was going to expand the building code County-wide it would be necessary to have enforcement and the ability to make inspections more than once a week. Mr. Schurr said that initially staff had discussed the idea of in-kind replacements not requiring a permit. Mr. Spedding agreed. He said that with regard to re-roofing, the County would get involved if someone was replacing asphalt shingles with tile, in which case there would be a concern about the extra weight of tiles. Chairman Springer asked whether the estimate of

a typical increase in fees of around \$2,000 included the road impact fee. Mr. Spedding said it did not. Mr. Mauk said the majority of people who would be affected by the expansion of the building codes would not be subject to the road impact fee. Chairman Springer said she had asked for discussion on this issue because it seemed to her that from the standpoint of public policy that separating out areas that would be subject to the building codes was not very good public policy. She said if the building codes were a good thing, they should be applied County-wide, and that then the Board would need to look at cost issues. She asked whether it could be made to apply to new construction only and whether that would help to reduce costs. Chairman Springer said that perhaps another possibility would be to just have a fee schedule for the various types of inspections and people could just call in and say they need an inspection and pay the fee. Supervisor Davis said he shared the concerns Supervisor Thurman had voiced regarding the outlying areas. He said it was very expensive to build when one lives in an outlying area because everything has to be imported. He said he believed that applying the building codes County-wide was appropriate, and that he would just like to be able to ensure that people cannot set up plywood and tarpaper shacks. Supervisor Thurman said he would love to see that happen, but that it would be very expensive to police. Supervisor Davis said he thought the County would just need to respond to complaints from neighbors, and that he would also like to minimize intrusion by the County. Supervisor Thurman said he had no problem going County-wide with the building codes but that it all came back to money. He said that in the rural areas the County would need to either charge more for permits or pay the difference from the General Fund, and make sure that inspectors can get inspections done. Supervisor Davis said there were some areas of the County where there would not be much building activity, and that perhaps it would be possible to set the County up by different zones. He said that, as someone who lived in town, he did not care for the idea of having to pay a higher fee for a building permit in order to subsidize someone who lived in Seligman. Supervisor Thurman said he thought the Board should also look at making the impact fee County-wide in order to make it fair for everyone. Chairman Springer agreed that the Board needed to talk about that issue, but said she was not sure it would be possible to do so on this day because it was not listed on the agenda. Mr. Schurr agreed that it should not be discussed on this day, and added that it was also something that Public Works would need to be involved in. Chairman Springer said she felt that as a matter of public policy, the fact that someone lives far away from the County seat should not result in the person having an exemption for that reason. She said she felt the building codes should be County-wide and that the Board could then discuss what should or should not be covered by inspections. She said that if additional inspectors needed to be hired, the Board would need to know what the cost would be. Mr. Spedding said there were statutory requirements regarding permits. Mr. Schurr said the statutory requirements applied to new construction or additions and did not include repairs or remodeling. He said he felt the County had a great deal of latitude in this regard and that in-kind replacements could be excluded from requiring a permit. Supervisor Davis said that if he lived in an outlying area he would expect to pay more for an inspection. He said his main two concerns were that what is built in the County be of good quality regardless of where in the County it is located, and that inspections be done on a timely basis. Chairman Springer said she agreed with the idea of requiring inspections for new construction and additions and leaving out remodeling. Supervisor Davis said Supervisor Thurman had expressed concern about electric issues and about new decks. Mr. Spedding said that an enclosed porch or patio could be turned into habitable space, and that he considered such items to be additions. He asked if the County would still require a permit but not perform inspections. Mr. Schurr said if the work involved an in-kind replacement no zoning clearance would be required, and that a zoning clearance would be needed only if there was an addition. He said he could look at amending the code to include structural alterations. There appeared to be general agreement to eliminate permits for the following items: Re-roofing; roof repair (structural); door replacement; window replacement; new doors and windows; replacement water heaters, gas and electric, provided there is no change of service from one to the other; bathroom remodel; new HVAC unit (central); remodel improvements; animal shades (over 200 square feet); barns; and electric service upgrade. Mr. Spedding said he could look at permit fees, adding that the County was currently lower than most other jurisdictions. Supervisor Thurman said he felt the Board would need to look at having satellites or some kind of County resources in some of the outlying areas so that people would not have to drive all the way to Prescott to obtain a permit. Mr. Schurr noted that the expansion would go into effect on July 1 and that it would happen absent some specific action by the Board. He said it would be very difficult to repeal the previous action at this point. He said if the Board wanted to look at amending the code, it could probably be done before July 1, but that he thought it might be a good idea to move forward with the approved expansion and see how it goes and then look at taking it County-wide. Chairman Springer said her preference would be to go County-wide at one time. She asked if staff could come back to the Board within another month so the Board could look at the public hearing process in May or June and implementing the expansion County-wide in July. Mr. Schurr said if the consensus of the Board was to expand the building codes County-wide it could probably be done in about three months. Mr. Spedding asked if the Board could

defer implementation of the already-approved expansion. Mr. Schurr said he would rather not do that and instead aim for County-wide implementation July 1.

S2. Discussion regarding proposed Planning and Zoning Ordinance amendments.

Mr. Lockard reviewed the list of proposed amendments, noting that several had already been through the Planning & Zoning Commission and would soon be coming to the Board, including amendments for: Outdoor lighting; elimination of use permit for three-story house; aisle width reduction in self storage; and time frame for temporary sales offices. He said that amendments related to planned area development and farm animals were being worked on. There was brief discussion regarding a proposal for a noise ordinance for commercial properties adjacent to residential properties. Mr. Spedding said he did not know how the County would be able to enforce such an ordinance, and Mr. Schurr said there were provisions in Title 13 of the Arizona Revised Statutes addressing disturbance of the peace. There was general agreement that a proposed golf course amendment was premature because necessary information from the Yavapai County Water Advisory Committee would not be available for quite some time. There was general agreement that an amendment to provide for a use permit for self storage facilities in C2 zoning if the facilities are within a certain distance of residential property was unnecessary. There was brief discussion regarding a proposed amendment to prohibit portable signs in C1 and C2 zoning districts. Chairman Springer said she believed that businesses should be able to put up signs, and there appeared to be general agreement with her statement. There also appeared to be general agreement that a proposed amendment to limit hours of operation in a C2 zoning district adjacent to residential property was not necessary. During discussion of a proposed amendment that would require the County to work with wastewater service providers to not issue permits for commercial operations until buy-in fees for wastewater are paid, Mr. Schurr said he did not believe the County could do that on a County-wide basis. Supervisor Davis said he thought cooperation with domestic wastewater improvement districts was appropriate and that the County should encourage the use of centralized wastewater systems. Mr. Schurr said he agreed, but that he had concerns about the County being placed in the position of ensuring that property owners pay buy-in fees and that he did not want to see the County become a collection agency for domestic wastewater improvement districts. There was general agreement to drop further consideration of the proposed amendment. Discussion turned to a proposed amendment to limit ATV/motorcycle use in residential areas. Mr. Lockard noted that this proposal was the result of action taken in November 2004 by the Board of Adjustment and Appeals, and that the idea was to look at how to keep ATV/motorcycle activity from become an "event" where someone might have as many as 20 of the vehicles being driven around their back yard. Chairman Springer asked if this type of use could be pursued under statutes related to disturbance of the peace. Mr. Schurr said it could be. Supervisor Davis said he believed this was a common sense issue. Mr. Mauk said that several times the department had been able to address this type of use successfully, when it could say that the use constituted an accessory use. He said that in instances where, for example, someone's grandchildren are coming for the weekend and they are riding ATVs in the back yard, he was not sure there was anything the County could do. Chairman Springer said she thought the Board would be going down a slippery slope to try to regulate this type of activity. Mr. Spedding said he thought that when people were bringing in ATVs from outside the subject property it was something that could be considered an accessory use. Mr. Schurr agreed, saying it could be dealt with in other ways rather than having to amend the ordinance. Mr. Lockard noted that a citizens group had been working on a proposal for a minor land division ordinance. Chairman Springer said she would just as soon forget it because any ordinance would just reflect state statutes. Mr. Schurr said it was optional to regulate such minor land divisions and that the County could not do so unless the Board approved it. Mr. Lockard said the group that brought the proposal forward was trying to be more proactive. After Mr. Schurr noted that several bills related to this issue were currently pending action in the legislature, Mr. Spedding suggested putting the minor land division proposal on the back burner. Discussion turned to pre-HUD mobiles and whether to permit them regardless of previous location provided they are rehabilitated and placed in appropriate zoning districts or to eliminate the allowance entirely. Supervisor Davis said he was in favor of not allowing them at all. Mr. Mauk said the County could say that mobile homes are prohibited unless they are in the County legally. Mr. Spedding said what he was hearing was that the Board wanted old mobile homes eliminated completed. In response to a question from Chairman Springer, Mr. Mauk said he believed that homes built in 1977 or later would be allowed, adding that a "mobile home" was anything built prior to 1976 and not to HUD standards, and that the proposed amendment would eliminate those mobile homes. Chairman Springer asked if this would hurt people by totally devaluing their property. Mr. Mauk said that, typically, the cost of rehabilitating an old mobile home was prohibitive. He said there were some communities in the County where old mobile homes were being brought in and used as rentals.

S3. Discussion regarding zoning/land use violation abatement process and procedures.

Mr. Mauk provided the Board with a flow chart showing the abatement process, saying that when an inspector goes out on a complaint if a violation is determined to exist the property owner is immediately served with a Notice of Violation and summons to appear at a hearing. He said this method had greatly expedited the process of dealing with violations, and that the department was receiving approximately 80% compliance prior to the hearing, another 15% of people came into compliance as a result of the hearing, and that 5% of the violations were real problems. Mr. Mauk said that in some cases, staff goes out to help the property owner abate the problem and that this was done primarily for people who wanted to cure the violation but who were unable to do it themselves. Discussion turned to filing liens against properties for which the County must abate the violation, with Mr. Spedding saying that in some cases it takes a great deal of money to clean up a property. Mr. Schurr noted that when a lien is filed it is subject to any existing mortgages and would be inferior to the lien for taxes. He said the department had experienced more success of late by taking cases through the justice courts. He added that the superior court process was lengthy, but that it did allow the County to ask that people be jailed for failure to abate a violation. Mr. Spedding said he wanted the Board to be aware that he would have to budget for clean-ups, and that it was expensive because in some cases existing structures would have to be removed. Mr. Schurr said the County also had a Weed and Trash Ordinance that could be used to address dilapidated buildings. Supervisor Thurman said he thought perhaps the Board should be looking at these on a case-by-case basis and approving expenditures for abatement. Mr. Spedding said that was how he handled them. Supervisor Davis said he would like to see the County focus on changing the process so the County could become first in line as a lien holder. He said the County needed to be able to recover its costs. Mr. Schurr said there had been attempts to introduce legislation to do just that, but that it had always failed. Chairman Springer said she could understand why legislation had not been successful. She asked if problems with structures related to health and safety issues or whether they had to do with exterior types of things. Mr. Schurr said that many of the problems were aesthetic issues. Chairman Springer asked how abatement could cost \$16,000 or more if it was just a matter of hauling off junk. Brief discussion ensued about situations where there are unpermitted mobile homes with no septic systems, and where there are abandoned vehicles. Chairman Springer said she agreed with Supervisor Thurman that requests to expend money on abatement should come to the Board on a case-by-case basis, but that staff should also research the property to find out what other liens may exist. Mr. Spedding asked if he should do that for all properties or whether the Board would like to see those properties that would cost more than \$5,000 to abate. Mr. Mauk noted that since the department had begun utilizing the services of a collection agency last year, it had collected more than \$25,000 in fines and sanctions.

S4. Discuss amending Subdivision Regulations to include defensible space requirements.

Mr. Spedding said this proposal would require a revision to the Subdivision Regulations in order to add some language regarding defensible space and that it would apply to new structures in subdivisions. Chairman Springer said she had a problem with it because the proposed language said that "...all residential lots, once built on" in the urban interface area would be subject to the rule and that she had a problem with telling people do something after they have built a house instead of before they start building. Supervisor Thurman said the City of Prescott looks at defensible space before issuing a permit. He said he had talked with people at the Groom Creek Fire District and that they had no problem with the proposal. Mr. Schurr said it appeared this would result in an ongoing maintenance responsibility. Mr. Spedding said it would apply only to new subdivisions and that it would be regulated by whichever fire district the subdivision was located in. Supervisor Thurman said that most of the lots in the interface area were not subdivision lots but lot splits, and he asked whether a new regulation for defensible space would even make a dent. Central Yavapai Fire District Fire Marshal Charlie Cook said that many new subdivisions were being developed in the interface area. He said that when he responded to plan review letters from the County he always put something down about a requirement to create defensible space. He said there had been discussions about putting such requirements in the CCRs for a subdivision but that CCRs could be changed and that it made more sense to put it on the final plat, but that it would not be possible to put it on the final plat unless it was approved in the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Cook said he believed the addition of defensible space requirements was minimal, that it would not be costly and that it would help prevent wildfire from coming through the Prescott area. He said that if the requirement was on the plat, then people would know about it before they purchase their property. He told the Board that the requirements would not result in clear-cutting, but would involve trimming trees to reduce fuel ladders. Mr. Cook said he was asking the Board to include defensible space requirements in the Subdivision Regulations because it would support what the Board has done in the past with regard to being involved with the Prescott Area Wildland Urban Interface

Commission, and with providing tree-cutting services to help deal with the bark beetle problem and also because it would help him in getting information about defensible space out to people. He told the Board that defensible space could become part of the construction process. He said that CYFD enjoyed a 99% success rate in getting people to comply with various requirements. Supervisor Thurman asked if the defensible space requirement would apply only to the PAWUIC area. Mr. Cook said it would apply County-wide. He said he had spoken with Sedona Fire District Fire Chief Will Loesch and that Chief Loesch was supportive of it. Supervisor Davis said the proposed language anticipated homeowner associations having some authority, and that this was something the County could not do. Chairman Springer said she still had a problem with it. She said that Mr. Cook's remarks were different from what the proposed written language said, and that she believed the written language needed additional work. She said she agreed with Supervisor Davis that reference to homeowner associations needed to be deleted, but added that she could not approve it with the current language. Mr. Schurr said the proposed language would be included with the Subdivision Regulations and would only apply to new subdivisions. Mr. Cook said he did not want to require a developer to create the defensible space, but to allow each homeowner to determine what trees should be left in place and what should be taken out and that he would like to see that happen as a house is being built or right after construction is completed. Chairman Springer said she still had a major problem with the language. Mr. Cook asked if making the requirement effective on a certain date would help so that it would not appear to apply to previously-approved subdivisions. Chairman Springer said she did not think the language was clear, and that it could be misinterpreted. Mr. Schurr said he was not certain it would be appropriate for the County to withhold final approval based on a letter from a fire district. Mr. Spedding said that was not the intent of the requirement, adding that staff would continue to work on the language.

S – COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR – All items presented by County Administrator Jim Holst.

S5. County Administrator's report on current activities.

Mr. Holst said that on March 25, 2005, he, along with Chairman Springer, Supervisor Thurman and several elected officials and department heads associated with the criminal justice system in the County had gone to Pinal County to visit the new justice facilities there. He said he was struck by how far Pinal County had gone in its development of this type of facility and by how much attention had been paid to security. He said he understood that Yuma County was working on something similar and that it might be a good idea to have some County officials visit that county as well. Mr. Holst said he was impressed by Pinal County's investment in its system and with how it had looked into the future to provide for a safe process. Turning to the topic of the budget, Mr. Holst said the state legislature had passed a budget that was subsequently vetoed by the Governor, and that as a result the legislature was currently setting up a process to see how it might come together on the budget. He said there was an item in the legislature's budget related to maintenance of effort that would have benefited Yavapai County and several other counties, but that overall things were looking okay with regard to the process. Mr. Holst said that budget packets had gone out to the departments and that budgets were due back to him by April 12, and that he hoped to have that information out to the Board members by April 15. He said this would move the process toward scheduled departmental budget meetings. Mr. Holst told the Board that he had included the employer's share of the Arizona State Retirement System increase (2.5%) in each department's budget and that he had also included 1% for merit increases but that he had made it clear that the Board had not yet approved either item. Supervisor Davis asked Mr. Holst when he would know what the Consumer Price Index was and what other jurisdictions were doing in terms of employee raises. Mr. Holst replied that Human Resources Director Julie Ayers was pulling together that information. He added that he was hoping to have tentative adoption of the budget on the Board's agenda for the June 20, 2005, meeting. Mr. Holst said there was an item on the Board's agenda for the April 4, 2005, meeting to staff a new pod at the jail, and that he did not know whether the Board would be considering a target for the Sheriff to meet in terms of whether beds would be leased for Immigration & Naturalization Service prisoners or whether the Board had a specific number of contract prisoners in mind. He said that if the Board authorized the new positions he would need to be able to identify the revenue source to pay for them, and that he believed 80% occupancy by contract prisoners would cover the cost of the new positions. There was brief discussion regarding whether transportation and medical services would be an issue with regard to INS prisoners. Moving on to a different subject, Mr. Holst said he had sent to the Board members by email a note that state statutes currently still require the use of the United States decennial census with regard to determining when a county must operate with a five-member Board of Supervisors. Chairman Springer said it appeared then that an election for a five-member Board would be required in 2012. Mr. Holst said that was correct, and a short discussion ensued regarding how often redistricting may occur for Supervisors. Mr. Holst said that with regard to cramped working conditions for the Public Defender and County Attorney at the Camp Verde Justice Facility, it would be

possible to use a portion of the Fleet Management storage facility at that location on an interim basis to help alleviate the working conditions. Chairman Springer said that, at this point, she would be reluctant to move forward with creating more courtroom space in Camp Verde and was more interested in seeing what could be done with the ball field next to the County administration building on 6th Street in Cottonwood. Supervisor Davis said the problem with where to put buildings always came back to transport issues with the jail, and that keeping everything in one place was helpful. Mr. Holst said he believed that a permanent solution to relieving space problems at Camp Verde for the Public Defender and the County Attorney was at least a year and a half away and that using the Fleet Management storage facility would be an interim measure. He said he and Facilities Director Pat Kirshman had looked at the building and that Mr. Kirshman was confident it could be remodeled into office space. Mr. Holst told the Board that he had been reviewing the lease and patent for Pioneer Park and that it would be necessary to address making some changes in the use of that property, half of which he said was under a lease due to expire in two years. He said the Board should pursue a more streamlined holding of the property so that it would not have to obtain approval from the Bureau of Land Management every time it wanted to do something with the property. Turning to the subject of improvements to Highway 260, Mr. Holst said that a meeting with affected property owners was held at the request of state Senator Ken Bennett and that he was currently going through a six-week review of issues and concerns related to the project. He said that, hopefully, there would be some resolution at the end of that six-week period. Supervisor Davis said there was still about four and one-half weeks to go, and that he hoped the process would generate a list of options. Mr. Holst turned his attention to the sewer treatment plant for the Camp Verde jail, saying that at its next meeting he would be asking the Board to authorize issuing a call for bids. He said he would be in contact with a representative of the Yavapai Apache Nation as well, but that he felt going to bid in order to obtain actual costs was something that needed to be done. With regard to the DeRienzo case, Mr. Holst said further hearings were on hold because Mr. DeRienzo and his attorney wanted a special action related to the executive session minutes. Mr. Hunt said that nothing in this regard had happened yet and that at some point the County would ask that the hearings move forward. Chairman Springer asked if there was any way for the County to recover attorney's fees in this type of process. Mr. Hunt replied that there were some limited provisions for it and that if there was an opportunity to recover fees the County would certainly take action to do so. Mr. Hunt added that with regard to the Big Chino Road issue, the law firm of Jones, Skelton and Hochuli had been retained because of the conflict of interest in the County Attorney's Office. He said that because of the conflict, he would not be able to act as the County contact for the law firm and that either Mr. Holst or Public Works Director Richard Straub would need to assume that role. Chairman Springer said she would prefer to have Mr. Holst be the contact. Mr. Holst said there had been discussions regarding the Public Defender's role as it relates to contract administration and that staff hoped to be better prepared to discuss that as part of the budget process dealing with the Public Defender's Office. Chairman Springer asked if there needed to be a separation between the Public Defender and the County Attorney with regard to contract administration. Mr. Hunt said he believed there would be a conflict if the Board was to put someone in the County Attorney's Office in the role of contract administrator. Mr. Holst said that if the Board desired to have Mr. Hunt assume the role of contract administrator it might be possible to relieve him of his role as a Deputy County Attorney and then approve hiring him as outside counsel. Mr. Holst said that with regard to technology issues, work was progressing on the Clerk of Court's scanning system, and that he would be meeting with the Assessor later on this day regarding the Assessor's software package. Supervisor Davis said that if the Assessor's software package was acceptable to and could interface with the Arizona Department of Revenue's program, then the County would no longer have to pay an annual fee to DOR. Mr. Holst said that was correct. He said he was continuing to work with the video system and would like to tweak it a bit more before moving forward with using it for Board meetings. He said that he and Ms. Staddon had been working together on how business in the Board of Supervisors' office flows and that Ms. Staddon would also be working with him on different projects. Mr. Holst said that an item had been placed on the April 4, 2005, agenda regarding the WAC Coordinator position and that it was critical to have some help from former Coordinator John Munderloh for the next couple of months. He said that because Mr. Munderloh was now working full-time for the Town of Prescott Valley, he anticipated that contracting with Mr. Munderloh would amount to around five hours a week. Mr. Holst told the Board that with regard to vehicle registrations in the Sedona area, another study was done through GIS and the information provided to the Motor Vehicle Division. He said that MVD had notified the County that it had identified some corrections, but that MVD had been advised that the County would like to take one more look at things before they were finalized. He said he would like to be in contact with the director on that and to ensure that the County was receiving updated information. Supervisor Davis suggested taking a look at the Wickenburg area with regard to vehicle registrations, saying the situation there could be similar to that in Sedona.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

_____ Clerk _____ Chairman